WORKING PAPER

Working Paper No. 12

AN ANALYSIS OF INTERNAL MIGRATION IN TAMIL NADU

C.T. Kurien and Abdul Huq

MADRAS INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
79, SECOND MAIN ROAD, GANDHINAGAR, ADYAR
MADRAS 600 020

Working Paper No. 12

AN ANALYSIS OF INTERNAL MIGRATION IN TAMIL NADU

C.T. Kurien and Abdul Huq

Madras Institute of Development Studies
79 Second Main Road
Gandhinagar, Adyar
MADRAS 600 020

JUNE 1980

AN ANALYSIS OF INTERNAL MIGRATION IN TAMIL NADU*

C.T. Kurien and Abdul Huq

This study is a preliminary analysis of the 1971 Census data on internal migration in Tamil Nadu. The Census had a schedule dealing with "persons born in one district but enumerated in some other district of the State". The information from that schedule does not, naturally, deal with movement of population over any specified period; it can only give a picture of the results of population movements of an indefinite period in the past as it was reflected at the time of the Census. We have made no adjustments in the basic data except for clubbing together the districts of Dharmapuri and Salem.

Some general features of internal migration in the State are discussed in Part I. It is followed by a detailed examination of the patterns of migration taking the analysis to the district level.

---

* This analysis was undertaken originally as part of a larger study of the Rural Transformation in Tamil Nadu from 1950-1975, funded by the ICSSR. But because an analysis of this kind was seen to be not particularly helpful in interpreting the nature of rural transformation it has not been included in the report of that Study to be published with the title : Dynamics of Rural Transformation : A Study of Tamil Nadu - 1950-75 (Orient Longmans). The authors wish to express their thanks to the ICSSR, to the Director of Census Operations, Tamil Nadu and Pondicherry for making available the data and to Mr. Chandrasekara Naidu for research assistance.

PART I: GENERAL FEATURES

In the Census figures the migrants are classified basically on the rural-urban pattern of migration and on the basis of sex. Table I gives a summary of the rural urban pattern of migration and the sex composition. It is seen that of the 2,936,213 persons "born in one district but enumerated in some other district of the State", 27.0 per cent had moved from one rural area to another rural area, 29.5 per cent had moved from rural areas to urban areas, 10.8 per cent from urban to rural areas and 32.7 per cent from urban areas to other urban areas. This means that the largest component of internal migration has been the movements within urban areas of the State, but that it is closely followed by the rural-urban movement. At the same time the rural-rural movement is seen to have been almost as significant as the rural-urban movement. It is interesting that there has also been a not insignificant urban-rural movement.

Another way of looking at the phenomenon is to see where the migrants come from. It is seen that 56.5 per cent of all who were enumerated in districts other than where they were born came from rural areas and the rest 43.5 per cent from urban areas. Similarly we may examine where the migrants moved into. Here, of course, the urban areas have a big lead claiming 62.2 per cent with the rest going into rural areas.

Turning to the sex composition of migrants it is seen, not unexpectedly, that females have a considerable lead in practically all categories. The sex ratio (i.e., the number of females per 1000 males) of the rural-rural migrants is as high as 2021. Females lead also in the urban-rural and urban-urban movements, the sex ratio in the former being 1496 and of the latter 1058. It is only among the rural-urban migrants that men are seen to be in the lead, the sex ratio in this category being as low as 889. Looking at the sex composition in terms of out-migration, 56.56 per cent of all who moved out of rural areas and 53.51 per cent of those who moved out of urban areas were females.

On the other hand the movements into rural and urban areas show different sex compositions. Females have the lead in the movement into rural areas (64.93 per cent of total) but in the movement into urban areas males have a lead accounting for 50.64 per cent of the total.

Another aspect worth noting is that while the urban-urban migrants constitute the largest single group when taking into account all persons, if females alone are considered, the largest group is the rural-rural migrants who account for 32.79 per cent of total female migrants as against 30.47 per cent in the urban-urban category.

PART II: INTER-DISTRICT MOVEMENTS

Having examined the general features of internal migration within the State we turn to an analysis of the inter-district pattern of migration.

At the State level the internal migration was examined primarily in terms of the rural-urban categories. At the district level also this will be the procedure. But at the district level a distinction has also to be drawn between "outmigration" and "inmigration" the former referring to those who moved out of a particular district into all other parts of the State and the latter to those who moved into a particular district from all other districts. Obviously this difference is not applicable at the State level when we deal with internal migration. In this section, total outmigrants from a district are indicated by TOM and total inmigrants into a district by TIM. In the case of any one district TOM need not be the same as TIM although at the State level $\Sigma TOM = \Sigma TIM$. Because of the distinction between outmigration and inmigration at the district level it is also necessary to distinguish between the rural-urban categories relating to the two. In the case of outmigration

the rural-rural movement is denated by RR, the rural-urban movement by RU, the urban-rural movement by UR and the urban-urban movement by UU. These categories are denated as R'R', R'U', U'R' and U'U' respectively with reference to inmigration. In both cases where a particular district is being dealt with, the first letter refers to that district itself and the second letter to the rest of the State. Thus RU in the case of outmigration denotes the outmigrants from rural areas of the district concerned to urban areas in all other parts of the State and R'U' refers to the immigrants into the rural parts of the district concerned from urban parts in the rest of the State and so on. It follows also that for any given district the comparable magnitudes, especially when the district's share in the State total is examined, are RR and R'R', RU and U'R', UR and R'U' and UU and U'U'. It may be noted also that at the State level

$$\sum RR = \sum R'R', \qquad RU = \sum U'R',$$

$$\sum UR = \sum R'U' \text{ and } \qquad UU = \sum U'U'$$

Table II gives total number of migrants who moved out of every district into the other districts of the State. The movements are classified on the rural-urban criterion. The information given in the table is annotated here with reference to Chingleput district. The figure in the first column (RR), 35,551, is the number of migrants out of the rural areas of Chingleput to the rural areas of all other districts in the State. Similarly 119,260 indicates migrants out of the rural parts of Chingleput to the urban parts of the rest of the State i.e., RU. The entry in the third column marked UR (12,181) correspondingly refers to migrants from urban Chingleput to the rest of rural Tamil Nadu and 55,435 in the fourth column (UU) indicates the number of migrants from urban Chingleput to other urban areas in the State. The next four columns give the sub-totals: 154,811 in column 5 gives the total migrants out of rural Chingleput

(i.e, RR+RU); 67,616 in column 6 refers to total outmigrants from urban Chingleput (i.e., UR+UU); 47,732 in column 7 gives the number of migrants from Chingleput moving into rural areas of the rest of the State (RR+UR); and 194,695 in column 8 correspondingly denotes the number of outmigrants from Chingleput going into urban areas elsewhere in the State (RU+UU). The figure in column 9 (222,427) is the grand total of those born in Chingleput but enumerated in other districts of the State. Column 9 is thus the sum of columns 1 to 4 as also of columns 5 and 6 or 7 and 8.

In Table III a similar analysis of inmigration is attempted. The classification is again on the rural-urban criterion. The entries in the table are to be interpreted as follows: Once again taking Chingleput as the example, R'R' (Column 1) refers to the number of people who moved into the rural areas of Chingleput from all other rural areas of the State, Column 2 U'R' indicates inmigrants into urban Chingleput from rural areas of other districts. Column 3 R'U' similarly refers to migrants into rural Chingleput from urban areas of the rest of the State. Column 4 U'U' indicates inmigrants into urban Chingleput from other urban areas in the State. Column 5 to 8 are sub-totals; column 5 showing the total of inmigrants into Chingleput from other rural areas and column 6 from other urban areas; column 7 total inmigrants into chingleput who settled in rural parts of Chingleput and column 8 in urban parts of Chingleput. Finally column 9 is the grand total summing up columns 1 to 4 or columns 5 and 6 or columns 7 and 8.

The information contained in Tables II and III is quite elaborate. Hence a classification of the districts in terms of the intensity of migration has been attempted to get a clearer picture of how different districts have fared in this matter. The classification is presented in Table IV for outmigration and Table V for inmigration.

It will be recalled that the largest single component of internal migration in the State is the urban-urban movement (Table I). Table IV shows that this movement can be considered to be high only in relation to three districts for outmigration, and that for the majority of the districts this is a low characteristic. Similarly, the rural-urban movement which ranks second at the State level features high only in relation to two districts. On the other hand, the UR movement which accounts for only one tenth of internal migration in the State is seen to assume high level in five districts. From these observations we can conclude that what appears as the main component at State level is seen to be significant only in terms of a few districts whereas the lowest component at the State level assumes high significance with respect to many districts. From Table V referring to inmigration also it is seen that the urban-urban movement is atypical among the districts while the urban-rural movement is more general among the districts. In terms of inmigration the rural-rural movement is the one that shows the largest number of districts among "high" the urban-rural and urban-urban movements show large number of "lows". From these it can be stated that although quantitatively the urban-urban and rural-urban movements are more significant, the more prevalent form of internal migration as experienced by the districts is the rural-rural movement.

When the actual figures contained in Tables II and III are converted into percentages it can be seen that Ramanathapuram, Tiruchirapalli, Tirunelveli and Madurai are the districts that show the highest share in outmigration and Madras City, Chingleput, Tiruchirapalli and Madurai districts show the highest percentages in inmigration. It is significant too that Madras City alone accounts for close to 19 per cent of inmigration. For Ramanathapuram and Tirunelveli outmigration is significantly larger than

their respective shares in inmigration (12.5 and 10.2 per cent outmigration as against 5.8 and 3.3. per cent inmigration respectively). North Arcot, Salem, Madurai, Thanjavur and Kanyakumari also have the same characteristics, but the differences between outmigration and inmigration in their cases is not so sharp. Similarly Madras City and Chingleput show considerably higher share in inmigration than in outmigration (18.7 and 12.8 per cent inmigration as against 7.8 and 7.6 per cent outmigration respectively). Other districts which show the same pattern are South Arcot, Coimbatore, Nilgiris and Tiruchirapalli. Thus, taking the State as a whole, Ramanathapuram and Tirunelveli lead in outmigration, and Madras City and Chingleput in inmigration.

These aspects are further examined in Table VI which shows for each district the number of inmigrants per 1000 outmigrants. It can be seen that Madras City, Chingleput, South Arcot, Coimbatore, Nilgiris and Tiruchirapalli are the districts which show inmigrants as larger than outmigrants. The proportion of inmigrants to outmigrants is the highest in the case of Nilgiris, followed by Madras City and Chingleput. It is lowest in the case of Tirunelveli. Other districts with very low proportions are Kanyakumari and Ramanathapuram, all in the Southern part of the State. Nilgiris occupies the first place in this respect even in terms of males and females separately. Madras City has a much higher proportion of males than females.

It was noted earlier that for each district the comparable magnitudes pertaining to outmigration and inmigration are RR and R'R', RU and U'R', UR and R'U', and UU and U'U', Column 2 to 5 in Table VI compare each district in terms of these magnitudes, Column 2 gives $\frac{R'R'}{RR}$ ratio, Column 3 the $\frac{U'R'}{RU}$ ratio, Column 4 the $\frac{R'U'}{UR}$ ratio and Column 5 the $\frac{U'U'}{UU}$

ratio. Thus each column gives the number of inmigrants per 1000 outmigrants in the comparable category. In terms of rural-rural migration Nilgiris has the highest inmigrants/outmigrants ratio followed by Thanjavur, and Chingleput. Other districts where inmigrants of this category exceed outmigrants are South Arcot, Tiruchirapalli, and Kanyakumari. The lowest inmigrant/outmigrant ratio is in the case of Tirunelveli. Salem and Ramanathapuram are other districts with very low inmigrant/outmigrant ratio. On the whole there is no major difference in the male, female group in the districts in this respect, but in Thanjavur and Chingleput the male figures are almost twice the female figures. In the case of the urban-urban movement seen in column 5 the top position is claimed by Chingleput which has a much higher inmigrant/outmigrant ratio than any other district including the city of Madras. The lowest rank goes to Kanyakumari where the urban-urban inmigrants are only one fifth of the outmigrants. Column 3 indicating the $\frac{U'R'}{RU}$ ratio (number of inmigrants coming into the urban area of a particular district from other rural areas per 1000 out-migrants from the rural area of the district into other urban areas) gives the first place to Nilgiris as in the $\frac{R'R'}{RR}$ ratio of column 2, but Chingleput and Thanjavur which have high ranks in column 2 have low ranks in column 3. Similarly Kanyakumari where the inmigrants are larger than the outmigrants in column 2 has considerably lower proportion of inmigrats in column 3. In column 4 ($\frac{R'U'}{UR}$ ratio) the first place goes to Chingleput as in column 5. There are six other districts where inmigrants of this category exceed outmigrants, and Kanyakumari claims the lowest position. Tirunelveli and Ramanathapuram are the only districts where inmigrants of all categories are less than outmigrants, both male and female.

The above observations do not take into account the shares of the districts in the total population of the State. Table VII gives figures relating to the population of the districts as well as the density of the population, and Tables VIII and IX show respectively the distribution of

outmigrants and inmigrants among the districts. These tables indicate that districts that claim a higher share in outmigration than their share in population are Madras City, Chingleput, Madurai, Tiruchirapalli, Thanjavur, Ramanathapuram and Tirunelveli. Ramanathapuram's share in outmigration is almost twice its share in population. In other cases the differences are only marginal. Correspondingly, Madras City, Chingleput, Nilgiris, Madurai and Tiruchirapalli account for higher shares in inmigration than their share in population with only Madras and Chingleput showing any significant difference. Taking all these into account it may be stated that internal migration is a significant phenomenon only in the case of Madras City, Chingleput and Ramanathapuram.

Another district that deserves special mention is Salem. Its share in inmigration (4.8 per cent) is considerably lower than its share in population (11.3 per cent). Besides, Table IV and V show that it belongs to the high group in RR and UR outmigration and also in R'R' and R'U' inmigration, but it is in the low group in RU and UU outmigration and also in U'R' and U'U' inmigration, i.e., it is high in migration out of and into rural areas, but low in migration out of and into urban areas.

Once again, referring back to Table VII it is seen that districts (other than the city of Madras) which account for the larger shares in inmigration are generally low density districts with population density less than that of the State with the exception of South Arcot where again the figure is only slightly above the State density. However, it is seen that districts that account for the largest shares in outmigration also have density of population lower than the State level. Hence it is doubtful whether the density of population plays a dominating factor in internal migration.

The sex composition of the out and inmigrations at the district level is worth noting and the basic information is given in Tables X and XI. It was noted in Part I that the rural-rural movement is pronouncedly a female phenomenon with the sex ratio being as high as 2021. The same pattern is seen at the district levels also with the exception of Nilgiris in the rural-rural inmigration. In fact in the rural-rural outmigration three districts show sex ratios of over 3000 and five districts, including the above three show sex ratios higher than the State average. In the case of inmigration seven districts have sex ratios higher than the State level in terms of rural-rural movements. In outmigration the UR and UU movements are also generally female dominated with only the RU movement showing, as at the State level, females less than males. As can be expected this is also reflected in the U'R' inmigrations, although six districts show figures over 1000 in this category. Looking at the totals provided in the tables it can be seen that practically all districts follow the State level patterns with sex ratio above 1000 in both rural and urban origins as well as in rural destinations, and sex ratio below 1000 in urban destinations. The inmigration table also reflects the same characteristics. Tirunelveli figures as an exceptional district. In migration out of the district the sex ratio is less than 1000 in all except the RR category and in the totals also the sex ratio is less than 1000 except in the case of those who having moved out of the district were enumerated in rural areas elsewhere. The district's out-migration, thus was heavily male dominated. Madras city shows a similar feature in terms of inmigration with a pronounced male domination.

We shall now turn to another aspect of inter-district migration. The problem is to state where the outmigrants from a district have gone into and where the inmigrants of a district have come from. The analysis is attempted for the total figures as well as for each of the migration types

already identified. Data were processed for each district and each of the migration types to identify the main districts which have enumerated persons born in one of the other districts (out migration) and the chief districts in which inmigrants enumerated in a district were born thereby giving what may be called the "chief migration links" of each one of the districts.

An in-depth probing into the nature of the links shows that in all cases the outmigration from a district is confined to a few other districts and the inmigration into a district also comes from a few other districts. There is also a very sharp difference between the shares of those that have been identified as chief links and other districts. As an example, South Arcot and North Arcot are Chingleput's chief links in RR outmigration accounting for 21.1 and 74.2 per cent respectively, but the third place is taken by Thanjavur whose share, however, is only 1.72 per cent. A look at the map of the State shows that in practically all cases the chief links identified are neighbouring districts. Thus one may conclude that by and large internal migration is geographically confined to the neighbouring areas for all districts.

What deserves attention, therefore, are the exceptions. The general presumption is that the exceptions are essentially related to movements from and into urban areas. For instance it is seen, not surprisingly, that Madras City is a chief link for UU outmigration irrespective of geographical contiguity. The same was seen in respect of RU outmigration where Madras is a chief link for all districts except Salem.

Since the exceptions are thus seen to be related to the urban phenomenon we have probed into it further taking up the UR outmigration and the U'R' inmigration. In the case of the former, chief links which are not neighbouring districts are the following: Thanjavur in the case of Madurai and Madurai and Chingleput in the case of Tirunelveli. The sole instance of neighbouring districts that do not figure as chief links is Ramanathapuram in the case of Thanjavur. In the U'R' inmigration chief links which are not neighbours are Tirunelveli in the case of Madras, Chingleput and Madurai in the case of Tirunelveli. Instances of neighbouring districts not showing up as chief links are South Arcot in the case of Salem and Tiruchirapalli and Coimbatore in the case of Madurai and Thanjavur in the case of Ramanathapuram.

To test the hypothesis further both RR outmigration and R'R' inmigration were also scrutinised. It is seen that Ramanathapuram in the case outmigration from and inmigration into Tiruchirapalli is the only exception, i.e., a neighbouring district not appearing as a chief link.

The analysis of internal migration in the State leads to the following conclusions: 1) The rural-rural type is the predominant pattern of internal migration viewed at the district level; 2) much of the internal migration in the State is from one district to its neighbouring districts; 3) internal migration is dominated by females.

TABLE I : Migration Types

Migration Types	Number of Migrants						Sex Ratio
	Male		Female		Total		
i. Rural-Rural	263131	(20.02)	531781	(32.79)	794912	(27.07)	2021
ii. Rural-Urban	458463	(34.88)	407780	(25.14)	866243	(29.50)	889
iii. Urban-Rural	125830	(9.57)	188210	(11.60)	314040	(10.69)	1496
iv. Urban-Urban	467103	(35.53)	494310	(30.47)	961413	(32.74)	1058
v. Total migration out of rural areas	721594	(54.90)	939561	(57.93)	1661155	(56.57)	1302
vi. Total migration out of urban areas	592933	(45.10)	682520	(42.07)	1275453	(43.43)	1151
vii. Total migrants into rural areas	388961	(29.59)	719991	(44.39)	1108952	(37.76)	1851
viii. Total migrants into urban areas	925566	(70.41)	902090	(55.61)	1827656	(62.24)	975
ix. Overall total of migrants	1314527	(100.00)	1622081	(100.00)	2936608	(100.00)	1234

(Note: Figures in brackets show the percentages.
i + ii + iii + iv = v+vi = vii+viii = ix).

TABLE II : Number of outmigrants

Districts	Outmigration Number of migrants out of every district into the rest of the State								
	RR	RU	UR	UU	From Rural (RR+RU)	From Urban (UR+UR)	Enumerated in Rural (RR+UR)	Enumerated in Urban (RU+UU)	TOM
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Madras	--	--	71806	157555	--	229361	71806	157555	229361
Chingleput	35551	119260	12181	55435	154811	67616	47732	174695	222427
South Arcot	81748	63205	17912	51395	144953	69307	99660	114600	214260
North Arcot	75246	89335	18162	68085	164581	86247	93408	157420	250828
Salem	89988	52090	23737	54875	142078	78612	113727	106965	220690
Coimbatore	67471	41300	24837	62145	108771	86982	92308	103445	194753
Nilgiris	3020	3805	4870	14325	6825	19195	7890	18130	26020
Madurai	79784	70740	37150	106004	150524	143154	116934	176744	293678
Tiruchirapalli	123744	67235	32135	84594	190979	116729	155875	151829	307708
Thanjavur	53499	74125	22396	105615	127624	128011	75895	179740	255635
Ramanathapuram	109237	136984	25576	95425	246221	121001	134813	232409	367222
Tirunelveli	65599	130339	17656	84755	195938	102411	83255	215094	298349
Kanyakumari	10025	17825	5622	21175	27850	26797	15647	39000	54647
State	794912	866243	814040	961383	1661155	1275423	1108952	1827626	2936578

TABLE III : Number of Inmigrants

Districts	R'R'	U'R'	R'U'	U'U'	From Rural (R'R'+U'R')	From Urban (R'U'+U'U')	Enumerated in Rural (R'R'+R'U')	Urban (U'R'+U'U')	TIM
	Inmigration: Number of migrants coming into every district from the rest of the State								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Madras	---	305875	---	243470	305875	243470	---	549345	549345
Chingleput	55632	78025	66525	176050	133657	242575	122157	254075	376232
South Arcot	99443	39705	33863	50920	139148	84783	133306	90625	223931
North Arcot	69330	21185	27580	42725	90515	70305	96910	63910	100820
Salem	54684	23500	23460	41350	78184	64810	77144	64850	142994
Coimbatore	51989	87250	19034	84025	139239	103059	71023	171275	242298
Nilgiris	36219	22826	7789	15420	59039	23204	54008	38240	82248
Madurai	69250	105315	174565	20800	86895	107695	90050	192210	282260
Tiruchirapalli	143324	75215	37394	89985	218539	127379	180718	165200	345918
Thanjavur	106251	43259	38420	50989	149510	89409	144671	94248	238919
Ramanathapuram	69691	39084	22130	40724	108775	62854	91821	79808	171629
Tirunelveli	28459	19895	14002	34130	48354	48132	42461	54025	96486
Kanyakumari	10640	5115	3043	4700	15755	7743	13683	9815	23498
State	794912	866243	314040	961383	1661155	1275423	1108952	1827626	2936578

TABLE IV : Out-migration

Rural-Rural (RR)	Rural-Urban (RU)	Urban-Rural (UR)	Urban-Urban (UU)
High (32.50-40.77)	High (42.65-53.63)	High (10.32-12.75)	High (35.55-41.32)
1. Salem (40.77)	1. Chingleput (53.62)	1. Coimbatore (12.75)	1. Thanjavur (41.32)
2. Tiruchirapalli (40.22)	2. Tirunelveli (43.44)	2. Madurai (12.65)	2. Kanyakumari (39.48)
3. South Arcot (38.15)		3. Salem (10.75)	3. Madurai (36.09)
4. Coimbatore (34.64)		4. Kanyakumari(10.48)	
		5. Tiruchirapalli(10.44)	
Medium (24.24-32.50)	Medium (31.67-42.65)	Medium (7.90-10.34)	Medium (29.77-35.55)
5. North Arcot (29.72)	3. Ramanathapuram(37.46)	6. Thanjavur (8.76)	4. Coinbatore (31.92)
6. Ramanathapuram (29.67)	4. North Arcot (35.76)	7. South Arcot(8.36)	
7. Madurai (27.17)	5. Kanyakumari (33.22)		
Low (15.98-24.24)	Low (20.69-31.69)	Low (5.48-7.90)	Low (23.99-29.77)
8. Tirunelveli (21.86)	6. South Arcot (29.50)	8. North Arcot (7.27)	5. Tirunelveli (28.15)
9. Thanjavur (20.93)	7. Thanjavur (28.99)	9. Ramanathapuram(6.95)	6. Tiruchirapalli(27.49)
10. Kanyakumari (16.82)	8. Madurai (24.09)	10. Tirunelveli (6.55)	7. North Arcot (27.25)
11. Chingleput (15.98)	9. Salem (23.64)	11. Chingleput (5.48)	8. Ramarathapuram(25.92)
	10. Tiruchirapalli(21.85)		9. Chingleput (24.92)
	11. Coimbatore (20.69)		10. Salem (24.84)
			11. South Arcot (23.99)

TABLE VII : Inmigration

Rural-Rural (R'R')	Urban-Rural (U'R')	Rural-Urban (R'U')	Urban-Urban (U'U')
High: (35.12-45.28)	High: (29.43-37.52)	High: (14.23-17.68)	High: (37.86-46.79)
1. Kanyakumari (45.28)	1. Madurai (37.52)	1. Chingleput (17.68)	1. Chingleput(46.79)
2. Thanjavur (44.47)	2. Coimbatore (36.00)	2. North Arcot (17.14)	
3. South Arcot (44.17)		3. Salem (16.52)	
4. North Arcot (43.08)		4. Thanjavur (16.08)	
5. Tiruchirapalli (41.43)		5. South Arcot (15.19)	
6. Ramanathapuram (40.21)		6. Tirunelveli (14.66)	
7. Salem (38.51)			
Medium (24.96-35.12)	Medium (21.33-29.43)	Medium (10.79-14.23)	Medium (28.93-37.86)
8. Tirunelveli (28.76)	3. Ramanathapuram(22.55)	7. Ramanathapuram (13.92)	2. Tirunelveli (35.74)
	4. Kanyakumari (21.77)	8. Kanyakumari (12.95)	3. Coimbatore (34.68)
	5. Tiruchirapalli(21.74)	9. Tiruchirapalli (10.81)	4. Madurai (30.68)
			5. Salem (29.12)
Low : (14.79-24.96)	Low: 13.23-21.33)	Low: (7.35-10.79)	Low: (20.00-28.93)
9. Madurai (24.45)	6. Tirunelveli(20.84)	10. Coimbatore (7.86)	6. North Arcot(26.55)
10. Coimbatore (21.46)	7. Chingleput (20.74)	11. Madurai (7.35)	7. Trichy (26.02)
11. Chingleput (14.79)	8. Thanjavur (18.11)		8. Ramanathapuram(23.32)
	9. South Arcot(17.80)		9. South Arcot (22.84)
	10. Salem (15.84)		10. Thanjavur (21.34)
	11. North Arcot (13.23)		11. Kanyakumari(20.00)

TABLE VI :Migration Ratios. (Number of inmigrants per 1,000 Outmigrants)

Districts	R'R'/RR			U'R'/RU			R'U'/UR			UU/U'U'		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Madras	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1767	1359	1545
Chingleput	2472	1311	1565	701	607	654	6438	4989	5461	3364	3012	3176
South Arcot	1442	1144	1216	620	638	628	1950	1855	1891	957	1023	991
North Arcot	942	914	921	229	246	237	1442	1560	1519	580	674	628
Salem	465	698	608	418	487	451	1164	1004	1073	702	803	753
Coimbatore	792	757	771	2367	1873	2123	889	680	766	1461	1257	1352
Nilgiris	12234	11758	11993	5695	6382	5997	1859	1396	1599	1174	992	1076
Madurai	821	892	868	1454	1528	1489	487	617	560	816	823	820
Tiruchirapalli	1138	1167	1158	1044	1201	1119	1777	1602	1670	1017	1108	1064
Thanjavur	3099	1587	1986	565	603	584	1852	1629	1715	443	521	483
Ramanathapuram	501	724	638	251	327	285	783	929	865	359	499	427
Tirunelveli	304	544	434	126	189	153	629	960	793	329	429	403
Kanyakumari	1140	1005	1061	278	302	287	566	524	541	225	219	222

TABLE VII: Population of the districts and the density of population

Districts	Percentage distribution of population			Density of population per sq. k.m.			(Index of population density with State density = 100)		
	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
Madras	---	19.80	5.99	---	19.293	19.293	---	912.20	6086.12
Chingleput	6.60	8.11	7.06	261	1577	367	112.99	74.56	115.77
South Arcot	10.80	4.12	8.78	291	2155	332	125.97	101.89	104.73
North Arcot	10.35	6.28	9.12	247	3290	306	106.93	155.56	96.53
Salem	12.98	7.54	11.33	209	2242	255	90.48	106.00	80.44
Coimbatore	9.80	12.49	10.61	191	1657	279	82.68	78.35	88.01
Nilgiris	0.87	1.95	1.20	153	268	194	66.23	12.67	61.20
Madurai	9.10	10.62	9.56	215	2872	312	93.07	135.79	98.42
Tiruchirapalli	11.37	7.01	10.05	213	2178	263	92.21	102.98	82.97
Thanjavur	9.67	6.19	8.62	350	2427	430	151.52	114.75	135.65
Ramanathapuram	7.36	5.99	6.94	174	1862	227	75.32	88.04	71.61
Tirunelveli	7.56	8.27	7.77	203	1356	280	87.88	64.11	88.33
Kanyakumari	3.54	1.64	2.97	620	4754	726	268.40	224.78	229.02
State	100.00	100.00	100.00	231	2115	317	100.00	100.00	100.00

TABLE VIII: Distribution of Outmigrants

Districts	RR	RU	UR	UU	From Rural	From Urban	Enumerated in Rural	Enumerated in Urban	Total
	Intra-district percentage distribution of the inmigrants into each district among the outmigrants types								
Madras	--	--	31.31	68.69	--	100.00	31.31	68.69	100.00
Chingleput	15.98	53.62	5.48	24.92	69.60	30.40	21.46	78.54	100.00
South Arcot	38.15	29.50	8.36	23.99	67.65	32.35	46.51	53.49	100.00
North Arcot	30.00	35.61	7.25	27.14	65.61	34.37	37.25	62.75	100.00
Salem	40.78	23.60	10.76	24.86	64.38	35.62	51.54	48.46	100.00
Coimbatore	34.47	21.09	12.69	31.75	55.56	44.44	47.16	52.84	100.00
Nilgiris	11.61	14.62	18.72	55.05	26.23	73.77	30.33	69.67	100.00
Madurai	27.17	24.09	12.65	36.09	51.26	48.74	39.82	60.18	100.00
Tiruchirapalli	40.22	21.85	10.44	27.49	62.07	37.93	50.66	49.34	100.00
Thanjavur	20.93	29.00	8.76	41.31	49.93	50.07	29.69	70.31	100.00
Ramanathapuram	29.75	37.30	6.96	25.99	67.05	32.95	36.71	63.29	100.00
Tirunelveli	21.99	43.69	5.92	28.40	65.68	34.32	27.91	72.09	100.00
Kanyakumari	18.39	32.62	10.29	38.74	50.97	49.03	28.64	71.36	100.00
State	27.07	29.50	10.69	32.74	56.57	43.43	37.77	62.23	100.00

Cont. TABLE VIII: Distribution of Outmigrants

Districts	Inter-district percentage distribution of each out-migration type								
	RR	RU	UR	UU	From Rural	From Urban	Enumerated in Rural	Enumerated in Urban	Total
Madras	--	--	22.87	16.39	--	17.98	6.48	8.62	7.81
Chingleput	4.47	13.77	3.88	5.77	9.32	5.30	4.30	9.56	7.57
South Arcot	10.28	7.30	5.70	5.35	8.73	5.43	8.99	6.27	7.30
North Arcot	9.47	10.31	5.79	7.08	9.91	6.76	8.42	8.61	8.54
Salem	11.32	6.02	7.56	5.71	8.55	6.16	10.26	5.85	7.52
Coimbatore	8.49	4.75	7.91	6.46	6.55	6.82	8.32	5.66	6.67
Nilgiris	0.38	0.44	1.55	1.48	0.41	1.51	0.71	0.99	0.89
Madurai	10.04	8.17	11.83	11.03	9.06	11.23	10.54	9.67	10.00
Tiruchirapalli	15.57	7.76	10.23	8.80	11.50	9.15	14.06	8.31	10.47
Thanjavur	6.73	8.56	7.13	10.98	7.68	10.04	6.84	9.83	8.71
Ramanathapuram	13.74	19.81	8.14	9.93	14.82	9.49	12.16	12.72	12.50
Tirunelveli	8.25	15.05	5.62	8.82	11.79	8.03	7.51	11.77	10.16
Kanyakumari	1.26	2.06	1.79	2.20	1.68	2.10	1.41	2.13	1.86
State	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

TABLE IX: Distribution of Inmigrants

Districts	Intra-district percentage distribution of the inmigrants into each district among the inmigrants types								
	R'R'	U'R'	R'U'	U'U'	From Rural	From Urban	Enumerated in Rural	Enumerated in Urban	Total
Madras	---	55.68	---	34.32	55.68	34.32	---	100.00	100.00
Chingleput	14.79	20.74	17.68	46.79	35.53	64.47	32.47	67.53	100.00
South Arcot	44.40	17.73	15.12	22.75	62.13	37.87	59.52	40.48	100.00
North Arcot	43.08	13.23	17.14	26.55	56.31	43.69	60.22	39.78	100.00
Salem	38.51	16.55	15.82	29.12	55.06	44.94	54.33	45.67	100.00
Coimbatore	21.46	36.00	7.86	34.68	57.46	42.54	29.32	70.68	100.00
Nilgiris	44.04	27.75	9.47	18.74	71.79	28.21	53.51	46.49	100.00
Madurai	24.53	37.37	7.37	30.79	61.84	38.16	31.90	68.10	100.00
Tiruchirapalli	41.43	21.74	10.81	26.02	63.17	36.83	52.24	47.76	100.00
Thanjavur	44.47	18.11	16.08	21.34	62.58	37.42	60.55	39.45	100.00
Ramanathapuram	40.61	22.77	12.89	23.73	63.38	36.62	53.50	46.50	100.00
Tirunelveli	29.50	20.62	14.51	35.37	50.12	49.88	44.01	55.99	100.00
Kanyakumari	45.28	21.77	12.95	20.00	67.05	32.95	58.23	41.77	100.00
State	27.07	29.50	10.69	32.74	56.57	43.43	37.77	62.23	100.00

Cont. TABLE IX: Distribution of Inmigrants

Districts	Inter-district percentage distribution of each in-migration types								
	R'R'	U'R'	R'U'	U'U'	From Rural	From Urban	Enumerated in Rural	Enumerated in Urban	Total
Madras	---	35.31	---	25.32	18.41	19.09	---	30.05	18.71
Chingleput	7.00	9.00	21.18	18.32	8.05	19.02	11.01	13.90	12.81
South Arcot	12.51	4.58	10.78	5.30	8.37	6.65	12.02	4.96	7.63
North Arcot	8.72	2.46	8.78	4.44	5.45	5.51	8.74	3.50	5.48
Salem	6.88	2.71	7.47	4.30	4.71	5.08	7.05	3.55	4.87
Coimbatore	6.54	10.08	6.06	8.74	8.38	8.08	6.40	9.37	8.25
Nilgiris	4.56	2.63	2.48	1.60	3.55	1.82	3.97	2.09	2.80
Madurai	8.71	12.16	6.62	9.04	10.51	8.44	8.12	10.51	9.61
Tiruchirapalli	13.02	8.68	11.92	9.36	13.16	9.99	16.30	9.04	11.77
Thanjavur	13.37	4.99	12.23	5.30	9.00	7.01	13.05	5.16	8.14
Ramanathapuram	8.77	4.51	7.05	4.24	6.55	4.93	8.28	4.37	5.84
Tirunelveli	3.58	2.30	4.46	3.55	2.91	3.77	3.83	2.96	3.29
Kanyakumari	1.34	0.59	0.97	0.49	0.95	0.61	1.23	0.54	0.80
State	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

TABLE : X Sex Ratio in Outmigration

Districts	RR	RU	UR	UU	From Rural	From Urban	Enumerated in Rural	Enumerated in Urban	Total
Madras	--	--	1798	1189	--	1349	1798	1189	1349
Chingleput	3575	997	2067	1153	1293	1275	3065	1044	1288
South Arcot	3090	915	1697	1044	1735	1180	2742	971	1527
North Arcot	3005	947	1824	1019	1545	1147	2704	978	1107
Salem	1570	936	1339	1026	1295	1111	1517	981	1226
Coimbatore	1547	1061	1429	1141	1338	1216	1514	1108	1282
Nilgiris	1027	785	1276	1172	885	1197	1174	1078	1106
Madurai	1930	901	1262	1103	1367	1142	1679	1017	1237
Tiruchirapalli	2446	901	1443	1068	1679	1160	2177	991	1455
Thanjavur	2792	934	1578	1053	1437	1129	2329	1004	1273
Ramanathapuram	1597	829	1295	942	1105	1007	1533	841	1049
Tirunelveli	1181	729	985	883	858	900	1136	787	872
Kanyakumari	1407	840	1442	948	1010	1034	1420	897	1022
State	2021	889	1496	1058	1302	1151	1851	975	1234

TABLE : XI Sex Ratio in Immigration

Districts	R'R'	U'R'	R'U'	U'U'	From Rural	From Urban	Enumerated in Rural	Enumerated in Urban	Total
Madras	--	787	--	914	787	914	--	841	841
Chingleput	1896	862	1602	1033	1187	1163	1728	977	1171
South Arcot	2451	942	1614	1155	1825	1290	2192	1035	1595
North Arcot	2917	1015	1972	1183	2208	1436	2592	1124	1818
Salem	2356	1090	1156	1174	1840	1167	1852	1143	1484
Coimbatore	1478	840	1093	981	1036	1001	1362	906	1021
Nilgiris	987	881	956	991	939	980	982	924	954
Madurai	2096	947	1600	1113	1283	1192	1965	1019	1248
Tiruchirapalli	2508	1036	1423	1164	1809	1234	2211	1104	1566
Thanjavur	1430	1001	1388	1234	1288	1300	1418	1122	1292
Ramanathapuram	2308	1080	1535	1307	1729	1382	2081	1190	1591
Tirunelveli	2117	1096	1504	1302	1597	1357	1884	1222	1472
Kanyakumari	1240	927	1335	922	1128	1066	1261	925	1107
State	2021	889	1496	1058	1302	1151	1851	975	1234